Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/523,014	YANNONI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Maryam Monshipouri	1656
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Maryam Monshipouri</u> .	(3)	
(2) Mr. P.J. Kastenmeyer.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 15 November 2007	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 112 second and 112 first		
Claims discussed: 16, 62-77	•	
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE C See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT W	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separation of the interview in resolution of all issues. A brief su</li> </ul>	on. The examiner will provide a wr arate record of the substance of the	ritten summary of the substance the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	olicant/Applicant's Representative	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413B)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the examiner indicated that SEQ ID NO:6 is novel and non-obvious and therefore a method of use of said sequence as claimed in claims 70-75 are allowable. However, claims such as base claim 16, 62 and their dependent claims cannot be allowed because they are directed to methods of use of products which have merely defined by function (as indicated in the perevious office action). In response, Mr. Kastenmeyer agreed with the examiner to cancel claims 16, 62-69, 76-77 as well as all withdrawn claims. He also gave authority to the examiner to amend and cancel claims accordingly, in an Ex. amendment.